



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART  
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 128 031

JC 760 467

TITLE Overview of Developmental Studies for Occupational Students: A Sourcebook for Post-Secondary Programs. Research Publication 76-4.

INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Ithaca. Cornell Inst. for Research and Development in Occupational Education.

SPONS AGENCY New York State Education Dept., Albany. Office of Occupational and Continuing Education.

PUB DATE 31 Jul 76

GRANT VEA-76-2-382

NOTE 63p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$3.50 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS \*Developmental Programs; Diagnostic Tests; Instructional Materials; Junior Colleges; \*Post Secondary Education; Program Content; \*Program Effectiveness; \*Remedial Programs; \*Resource Guides; Student Characteristics; Teaching Methods

## ABSTRACT

This publication is intended to be used as a sourcebook and reference by practitioners interested in postsecondary developmental programs, with a particular focus on occupational students. The information presented was derived from a statewide survey of staff members involved in the operation of developmental programs in 51 two-year colleges and 10 Educational Opportunity Centers in New York State (58% responded). Part I, State of the Art, compiles the survey data regarding college and student characteristics, developmental program characteristics, program components, and ratings of program success. Part II, Program Descriptors, describes a composite mythical most successful developmental program, and compares survey responses by the various types of institutions surveyed to the composite profile. Part III, Program Resources, lists recommended resources for reading, writing, study skills, math, and vocational-personal/decision-making programs in regard to desired outcomes, standards of success, strategies/approaches, measurement tools, instructional materials, and modes of instruction, and compiles consensus recommendations for programmatic standards. Part IV, Human Resources, lists respondents willing to serve as contact persons. (BB)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished \*  
\* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort \*  
\* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal \*  
\* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality \*  
\* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available \*  
\* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not \*  
\* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions \*  
\* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

# OVERVIEW

ED128031

## DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES FOR OCCUPATIONAL STUDENTS

A SOURCEBOOK FOR  
POST-SECONDARY PROGRAMS

**OVERVIEW OF DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES  
FOR OCCUPATIONAL STUDENTS:  
A SOURCEBOOK FOR POST-SECONDARY PROGRAMS**



**Cornell Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education  
Department of Education, New York State College of Agriculture  
and Life Sciences, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York**

**in cooperation with:**

**Office of Occupational Education  
and  
Grants Administration Unit  
New York State Education Department  
Albany, New York**

**July 31, 1976  
Research Pub. 76-4**

OVERVIEW OF DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES  
FOR OCCUPATIONAL STUDENTS:  
A SOURCEBOOK FOR POST-SECONDARY PROGRAMS  
(VEA-76-2-382)

PROJECT STAFF

Gene M. Winter, Acting Director, CIOE  
LaVerna M. Fadale, Research Associate  
Harry Bloodgood, Research Assistant  
Carol Adomiak, Editorial Staff  
Beverly French, Editorial Staff

STEERING COMMITTEE

Virginia Abrahamsen  
College Skills Coordinator  
Agricultural and Technical College at Delhi

Dolores Bullard  
Assistant Dean for Academic Programs  
Bronx Community College

Nancy A. Hoddick  
Associate in Higher Education Guidance  
NYS Education Department

George H. Howard  
Dean for Special Education  
SUNY/Central Administration

Rosemary Lanshe  
Director of Reading and Study Skills Center  
Agricultural and Technical College at Alfred

Robert McKinney  
Vice-President for Faculty Affairs  
Monroe Community College

Roger A. Wingett  
Dean of Students  
Jamestown Community College

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This publication is designed to be used as a sourcebook and reference by practitioners interested in the various kinds of post-secondary educational programs that are termed developmental. The information presented herein was derived from a statewide survey of New York State two-year college staff members directly involved in the day-to-day operations of these programs. Twelve of these staff members, identified on the following page, joined the project staff in a two-day workshop at which time suggestions on both format and content emerged in reaction to a working draft. We have attempted to incorporate their ideas and suggestions throughout the document and sincerely appreciate the efforts of these people on behalf of the project.

We also extend special appreciation to the staff members who have agreed to be listed as contact persons for their programs. They appear in Part IV of this sourcebook.

The project advisory committee members have not only met with us at scheduled sessions and provided on-going contact, but early in the project responded to an open-ended questionnaire that guided the development of the survey instrument.

A share of any credit rightfully belongs to those who have had a hand in the process but we accept full responsibility for any perceived shortcomings.



Dr. Gene M. Winter  
Acting Director - CIOE



Dr. LaVerna M. Fadale  
Research Associate - CIOE

Funds for this project were provided by Section 122(a) of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, administered by the New York State Education Department

COOPERATING STAFF MEMBERS

Virginia Abrahamsen  
College Skills Coordinator  
Agricultural and Technical College at Delhi

Judith Barbanel  
Assistant Professor & Principal Investigator  
Writing Lab for Career Students  
Queensborough Community College

Carol Benjamin  
Learning Center Coordinator & Reading Instructor  
Junior College of Albany

Lorraine C. Boaz  
Instructor  
Schenectady EOC

Donald Cohen  
Professor of Mathematics  
Agricultural and Technical College at Cobleskill

Norma Eill  
Associate Professor  
Orange County Community College

Nancy Hoddick  
Associate in Higher Education Guidance  
NY State Education Department

George Howard  
Dean for Special Education  
SUNY/Central Administration

Ellen Klohmann  
Instructor  
Rockland Community College

Earle M. Lacy  
Associate Director  
Buffalo EOC

Henry J. Pruitt  
Assistant Professor & Chairman  
Dept. of Developmental Studies  
Borough of Manhattan Community College

Russell E. Wise, Jr.  
Director, HEOP  
Junior College of Albany

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## INTRODUCTION

page

1

## STATE OF THE ART

page

4

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTORS

page

11

## PROGRAM RESOURCES

page

20

## HUMAN RESOURCES

page

38



# INTRODUCTION

Several years ago the term "new student" often referred to economically and/or educationally disadvantaged students that were entering two-year colleges through the "open-door". More recently the term non-traditional student has also been used to describe other new students; people seeking a career change, women and working adults returning to update or acquire employment skills, or individuals simply sampling the expanding offerings of the two-year college.

The institution has recognized the needs of the new and newer students for educational experiences of a remedial or developmental nature in order to increase their chances of success in their academic and career pursuits. This institutional recognition has given rise to a wide variety of program efforts across the state that are often referred to as developmental studies. There is however no universally accepted definition of developmental studies. For the purposes of this study and publication an inclusive description is appropriate: *Developmental studies programs are organized educational efforts providing a range of learning experiences intended to ameliorate educational skill and attitude deficiencies of students.*

The goal with this sourcebook is to compile and summarize the state of the art in this diverse area with particular focus on occupational education students. The sourcebook is a guide to what is happening and a resource of procedures and materials for staff members seeking to initiate or improve existing programs. The publication also provides a human resource list -- names and addresses of two-year college staff members working in developmental studies programs who have agreed to share ideas and problems with others.

Source of Information. The information in this sourcebook is derived from data collected during a statewide survey of developmental program efforts. The sample was comprised of 51 two-year colleges that offer programs in occupational education and 10 SUNY Educational Opportunity Centers. The total return rate was 58% with responses from five agricultural and technical colleges, six private colleges, four EOC centers, and 20 community colleges -- three of which were inner-city/urban. The questionnaires consisted of items that had been derived from four sources: a) survey of the literature to procure a general overview; b) review of VEA-funded developmental projects (1970-76) to attain a sense of programming for occupational students; c) written reactions of the project advisory committee to open-ended questions in order to obtain a valid vocabulary/concept pool, and d) staff experiences and field inputs.

The responses have been synthesized from the returned questionnaires by the project staff, and arranged into this sourcebook with assistance from cooperating two-year college staff identified in the acknowledgements.

Format of Sourcebook. Four major parts constitute the handbook. Part I, State of the Art, reports the survey data in summary form. Part II, Program Descriptors, contains three sections which consist of a scenario of a composite program based on survey data, a statement in recognition of diversity among programmatic efforts and a summary of program commonalities and standards. Part III, Program Resources, identifies, by component, relationships between instructional resources and selected characteristics of settings in which they exist.

Part IV, Human Resources, lists college staff members working in developmental studies programs who have agreed to be identified as resource personnel and willing to share with others. Attachments supplement the information presented in the four parts of the document.

Delimitations. The reader is reminded that the contents of this sourcebook are based upon self-assessment data from respondents. Although bias must be present, the data does not appear to be unreasonable. Also, the authors know of several worthy programs that are not included in the list of respondents because staff members chose not to respond to the request for information. The response rate and subjective nature of the data notwithstanding, we feel that the sourcebook can be a valuable tool. Too often in education, information is not shared because it requires reader judgment and interpretation. In this case, we feel that sharing is appropriate in hopes that the critical instructional success variable, the teacher, might locate an otherwise hidden resource, concept or strategy.

# STATE of the ART

Part I provides a summary of survey results related to developmental program descriptors and the environmental characteristics in which they function. The diversity of programs becomes less evident in this kind of summation; however it does reflect the state of the art as reported. The data are the perceptions of respondents from 35 institutions. For easy reference, a question-and-answer format is employed. Percentages do not always total 100 due to rounding and multiple responses.

*What is a general description of the total student body?*

-- Socio-economic level

|                |     |
|----------------|-----|
| upper levels:  | 2%  |
| middle levels: | 55% |
| lower levels:  | 43% |

-- Background

|                 |     |
|-----------------|-----|
| inner-city:     | 13% |
| suburban-urban: | 47% |
| suburban-rural: | 38% |

-- Minority Population

|               |     |
|---------------|-----|
| less than 5%: | 32% |
| 5% to 25%:    | 41% |
| 26% to 50%:   | 9%  |
| over 50%:     | 9%  |
| no response:  | 9%  |

-- Goal Orientation

|           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| strong:   | 21% |
| moderate: | 47% |
| weak:     | 32% |

-- Common Needs of Student Body

Academic:

|                       |     |
|-----------------------|-----|
| reading skills:       | 94% |
| study skills:         | 94% |
| communication skills: | 84% |
| math skills:          | 69% |

Non-Academic:

|                                     |     |
|-------------------------------------|-----|
| motivation:                         | 72% |
| career decision-making skills:      | 72% |
| knowledge of self:                  | 59% |
| personal goal setting:              | 53% |
| ability to cope with cultural gaps: | 25% |

*What is a general description of the total college faculty?*

Responses to critical items relative to  
faculty are summarized below:

-- Faculty Attitudes Toward Non-Traditional Students

|                              |     |
|------------------------------|-----|
| a positive attitude:         | 28% |
| a moderate/neutral attitude: | 47% |
| a negative attitude:         | 25% |

-- Faculty Attitudes Toward Value of Career Programs

|                 |     |
|-----------------|-----|
| high value:     | 75% |
| moderate value: | 16% |
| no value:       | 6%  |

-- Climate for Faculty Freedom and Staff Inputs

|                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| very encouraging:       | 63% |
| moderately encouraging: | 37% |
| restrictive:            | 0%  |

*What generally is the institutional response to needs?*

Three items addressed the institutional aspect of climate -- specifically in terms of student needs, community pressures and faculty needs. As the responses to the three items are similar, they are summarized as one item.

-- Responsiveness of Institution to Needs

|                    |     |
|--------------------|-----|
| active:            | 41% |
| moderately active: | 50% |
| passive:           | 19% |

*What general characteristics constitute developmental programs?*

Selected characteristics provide general information relative to programmatic structure, as subsequently summarized.

-- Identified Program Patterns

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| block-scheduling:                       | 28% |
| skill and remedial courses:             | 82% |
| skill centers:                          | 50% |
| supplementary services/assistance:      | 53% |
| each instructor assumes responsibility: | 9%  |

-- Current Source of Funding

|                                  |     |
|----------------------------------|-----|
| college funds:                   | 65% |
| grant funds:                     | 13% |
| combination grant/college funds: | 19% |
| other:                           | 10% |

-- Recruitment Procedures

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| testing during orientation:                    | 53% |
| student self-selection:                        | 50% |
| faculty recommendation/referral:               | 40% |
| special recruitment activities:                | 35% |
| selection by admission personnel:              | 28% |
| selection by faculty and admissions personnel: | 25% |
| faculty/staff review:                          | 19% |

-- Criteria Used in Selection Process

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| standardized test scores:                    | 75% |
| high school records:                         | 53% |
| recommendations from high school counselors: | 38% |
| recommendations from high school staff:      | 6%  |
| skill test scores:                           | 22% |
| other, i.e. self-selection:                  | 13% |

*What is a general description of students enrolled in career-oriented or occupational education programs?*

Input was received from faculty and staff at two-year institutions offering programs in occupational education. However, not all students at each of these campuses are enrolled in a career program. In order to establish perspective, responses to demographic items relative to the target group are summarized.

-- Percent of Student Body Enrolled in Occupational Programs

|           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| over 60%: | 38% |
| 40-60%:   | 26% |
| under 40% | 36% |

-- Percent of Students Served by Developmental Programs That Are Enrolled in Occupational Education

|                     |     |
|---------------------|-----|
| over 75%:           | 42% |
| about 50%:          | 23% |
| less than 40%:      | 19% |
| unable to estimate: | 16% |

-- Description of Primary Audience Served by Developmental Programs

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| day students:                          | 81% |
| full-time students:                    | 81% |
| degree students:                       | 56% |
| certificate program students:          | 25% |
| pre-program students:                  | 19% |
| part-time students:                    | 16% |
| general studies students:              | 16% |
| other; i.e. community center, evening: | 9%  |

-- Procedures Used by Occupational Students to Enter Developmental Programs

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| volunteer:   | 44% |
| faculty advisement:                                      | 53% |
| admission scheduling:                                    | 40% |
| other; i.e. testing, counseling,<br>high school records: | 19% |

*How are developmental efforts generally viewed in terms of effectiveness?*

In order to provide an initial reference to effectiveness of developmental/remedial efforts, two subjective ratings were requested; 1) how they rated their program, and 2) how they perceive that others would rate their program.

-- Rating of Overall Success of Program

|                        |     |
|------------------------|-----|
| very successful:       | 62% |
| moderately successful: | 16% |
| less successful:       | 6%  |
| no response:           | 16% |

(The criteria on which these judgments were made are listed in terms of the frequency identified.)

student feedback (40%)  
retention rate (38%)  
GPA or academic achievement (28%)  
staff judgments (13%)  
testing measures (13%)  
faculty-staff response (9%)  
placement rate (6%)  
completion of developmental/remedial program (6%)  
administrative approval (3%)  
availability of services (3%)  
student-teacher relationships (3%)

-- Rating of How Other Faculty and Staff Would Perceive Overall Success of Program

|                        |     |
|------------------------|-----|
| very successful:       | 41% |
| moderately successful: | 25% |
| less successful:       | 16% |
| no response:           | 18% |



These two ratings of total program success are summarized by mean average on a scale of 1-5. The data indicates that programs are viewed as better than moderately successful by respondents (3.7), however other faculty tends to view them less so (3.1).

Each program has discrete characteristics. Diversity among efforts remains a constant. The design of programs as reflected by data can be generally categorized into four basic programmatic approaches as follows:

1) Block Scheduling: usually four credit-bearing courses that most, if not all, developmental students take for one semester; subjects include reading, writing and study skills in most programs, mathematics, and vocational-personal guidance in many programs.

(Frequency of Use: 30% combined with other designs; 13% Block only.)

2) Centers: usually a physical area for a learning center or skill center that provides for a focus for the program's learning activities, individualized instruction, referral, and audio-visual and/or material resources.

(Frequency of Use: 67% combined with other designs; 7% Centers only.)

3) Designated Courses: usually one or two credit courses in basic language and study skills and/or a course in one or more departments that has been designed as a remedial or developmental course in a particular subject field (i.e. communication, math, physics, social science, personal psychology).

(Frequency of Use: 60% combined with other designs; 13% Courses only.)

4) Integrated Teaching: a policy with and the responsibility for conscious effort to integrate remedial or developmental instruction in regular course offerings as needed by the students enrolled.

(Frequency of Use: 10%.)

Ratings of overall success within each programmatic approach did not vary appreciably from the mean:

|                          |     |               |     |
|--------------------------|-----|---------------|-----|
| Block Approach           | 3.6 | Other Faculty | 2.9 |
| Center Approach          | 3.9 | Other Faculty | 3.9 |
| Course/Teaching Approach | 3.7 | Other Faculty | 3.2 |

Self-Assessment of Program Components. Respondents were also asked to rate their respective program components on a continuum with end points of "most successful" and "least successful". Approximately 60% of the respondents rated two or more components. These data are summarized as mean ratings in the following frequency table.

FREQUENCY TABLE OF SUCCESS RATINGS BY PROGRAM COMPONENT

| Program Components                     | Least Successful |     | Most Successful |
|--|------------------|-----|-----------------|
| Reading                                | 2                | 6   | 7               |
| Study Skills                           | 1                | 6   | 4               |
| Math                                   | 1                | 6   | 4               |
| Writing                                | -                | 2   | 4               |
| Vocational/Personal<br>Decision-Making | 1                | 2   | 3               |
| English                                | 1                | 1   | 3               |
| Tutoring                               | 1                | -   | 3               |
| Counseling and Related                 | 1                | 2   | 5               |
| Total                                  | 7                | 25  | 33              |
| Percentage                             | 11%              | 38% | 51%             |

Of the components that were rated by a minimum of 10 respondents, reading was seen as most successful by the largest percentage (46%) followed by math and study skills (37%).

# PROGRAM DESCRIPTORS

## Composite College

The self-assessment responses were used as a criteria from which to develop a composite of a mythical most successful program. The programs included in this composite profile were selected on these criteria:

- a minimum of one rating of four or above on the overall program assessment rating.
- a minimum of two program components rated at "most successful".

Five programs met both criteria. The figures given in the text are a mean average of responses given by the five programs to the questionnaire items, expressed on a scale of one to five. All data is subjective, therefore interpretations should be made with caution. The composite does however provide a kind of performance standard given the available data. The criteria (self-assessment ratings) result in urban/inner-city and EOC programs being excluded from this composite.

The climate as a whole, at Composite College is not unlike the mean ratings, on a scale of one to five, found across the state. The entire faculty are encouraged to experiment to a moderate degree (3.6), value effective teaching (4.2), and are not overly positive (2.8) in their attitudes toward non-traditional students. They have a moderate voice in governance (3.2) and their attitudes toward the value of career programs is middle-of-the-road (3.6).

The total student body is largely lower and lower-middle class (2.6) from suburban-rural homes (2.8). The minority population is approximately 20%. The students, as a whole, exhibit an average goal orientation (3.2) and 56% of the student body are enrolled in occupational programs.

The institution is moderately responsive to needs of students (3.0), faculty (3.4), and community (2.8). The needs of the student

body are perceived to be as follows: reading, communication, and study skills are highest priority, closely followed by self-awareness and motivation. Skills in mathematics, personal goal setting, career decision-making and cultural differences are identified as less pressing needs.

Out of this institutional context a developmental studies program was organized using the block scheduling design and supplemented by a skills center operation managed by volunteer faculty. The block schedule includes elective credit courses in reading, composition, mathematics and study skills in a class/lab format. Counseling and tutoring assistance are available, and in addition, course instructors infuse attitudinal and interpersonal experiences with cognitive/basic skills and applied field experiences. The center offers short-term help to any student who so requests as well as assistance to course instructors with materials and techniques. Most courses meet four hours weekly with an additional hour in the lab being the norm rather than the exception. The block schedule is repeated second semester with smaller enrollments and additional non-credit courses in reading and writing skills that progress beyond the basic course level offered by the center.

The program serves approximately 75 full-time degree students, about 50% in occupational programs, but does not exclude part-time or general studies students that are recommended for enrollment.

The program staff currently reports to the Academic Dean but the Dean of Students works closely with the program in both planning and implementation. The program was initiated with grant support but is now totally funded from the operating budget. Administrative support

has been relatively strong, especially when the program was new and served primarily HEOP students but current educational economics is forcing some accountability questions to be raised.

The recruitment and selection process is a combined effort of staff and admissions counselors. Student self-selection is encouraged through special publicity as well as by faculty referral or advisor recommendation. Skill testing during orientation with a variety of instruments is an important selection criterion together with high school records and recommendations from high school counselors when available.

The program staff assess their results in a combination of ways: pre-post skill level measures, student satisfactions, grade point averages and retention rate comparisons. The developmental studies program staff make concerted efforts to promote faculty interaction through individual conferences, student referral, follow-up meetings and joint planning/consultation. This interaction is enhanced by the status of program staff as faculty members who do some teaching outside of the developmental studies area. The developmental studies staff are usually faculty advisors of the developmental studies students but not always. The developmental studies faculty also act as liaison personnel between the program and the counseling staff and departmental faculty groups.

The developmental studies faculty are proud of their program and rate its success as better than average (3.9). However, they still feel that the college has an element of elitism with which they must contend. They feel that parts of their program are needed by more students but the problems of credit and cost are difficult to combat.

In spite of relatively good success, the struggle for full acceptance of programs for the high-risk student remains.

### The Realism of Diversity

The staff members, identified in the acknowledgements, who attended the workshop to cooperatively revise the working copy of this sourcebook, found a need to address the diversity that is present among two-year institutions, and which may become obscured through summation of data. Consensus was reached that such diversity could most effectively be described relative to the Composite College scenario which is based on a segment of the total data.

A major goal of two-year colleges is to meet the specific needs of individual students. Out of this focus emerges elements of diversity found at institutions generally and with developmental efforts specifically. There are various definitions of developmental studies, and differing perspectives as to what is appropriate for a developmental program. There is also a range of diversity with clientele, and as previously noted, this range continues to expand in comprehensiveness.

The workshop participants addressed the diversity in terms of four institutional groupings -- Agricultural and Technical, EOC, upstate community colleges, and city-urban community colleges. The information utilized in the Composite College was used as a guide in summarizing numerical data relevant to survey respondents within each grouping. These mean ratings are presented in a Comparison Summary Chart.

SUMMARY COMPARISONS OF INSTITUTIONAL GROUPINGS

| Item<br>(Scale 1-5)                                    | Composite<br>College<br>(N = 5) | Ag and Tech<br>(N = 5) | EOC<br>(N = 4) | City<br>Community Colleges<br>(N = 3) | Upstate<br>Community Colleges<br>(N = 22) |
|--|---------------------------------|------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| <u>Climate: Faculty</u>                                |                                 |                        |                |                                       |   |
| Freedom to experiment                                  | 3.6                             | 4.4                    | 2.6            | 3.6                                   | 4.0                                       |
| Value-effective teaching                               | 4.2                             | 4.6                    | 3.6            | 4.6                                   | 4.3                                       |
| Faculty attitudes toward<br>non-traditional students   | 2.8                             | 3.2                    | 4.0            | 3.3                                   | 2.9                                       |
| Faculty voice in governance                            | 3.2                             | 4.6                    | 3.0            | 4.6                                   | 3.4                                       |
| Attitude toward value of<br>career programs            | 3.6                             | 4.8                    | 4.0            | 3.6                                   | 3.8                                       |
| <u>Climate: Students</u>                               |                                 |                        |                |                                       |   |
| Socio-economic status of<br>student body               | 2.6                             | 2.6                    | 1              | 2.5                                   | 2.6                                       |
| Minority student population*                           | 20%                             | 25%                    | 50%+           | 23%                                   | 10%                                       |
| Student goal orientation                               | 3.2                             | 3.8                    | 3.3            | 4.6                                   | 2.7                                       |
| Background of student body                             | 2.8                             | 2.4                    | 5              | 4.6                                   | 2.7                                       |
| Student body in occupational<br>programs*              | 56%                             | 75%+                   | 52%            | 35%                                   | 47%                                       |
| <u>Climate: Institution</u>                            |                                 |                        |                |                                       |   |
| College response to student<br>needs                   | 3.0                             | 3.6                    | 4.3            | 3.3                                   | 3.6                                       |
| College response to<br>community needs                 | 2.8                             | 4.6                    | 3.3            | 3.6                                   | 3.2                                       |
| College response to faculty<br>needs                   | 3.4                             | 3.2                    | 3.0            | 3.0                                   | 3.0                                       |
| <u>Self-Assessment Ratings</u>                         |                                 |                        |                |                                       |   |
| Overall success of program                             | 3.9                             | 4.0                    | 3.3            | 4.0                                   | 4.1                                       |
| Perception of other staff<br>rating of program success | 3.7                             | 3.7                    | 3.3            | 3.6                                   | 3.5                                       |
| <u>Students served by Developmental<br/>Programs</u>   |                                 |                        |                |                                       |   |
| Proportion enrolled in<br>occupational education*      | 50%                             | 80%                    | 85%            | 50%                                   | 52%                                       |

\* percentages rounded off



As discernible from the chart, the category of Upstate Community Colleges has the greatest number of respondents, while the other groupings range from three to five. Observations should be made within this perspective. Discussion will focus only on those ratings that have a mean of four or above, and of two or below, and that vary from the composite mean a minimum of .5.

Agricultural and Technical Colleges. Data from Agricultural and Technical respondents suggest that their faculty enjoy a greater freedom to experiment (4.4) and voice in governance (4.6) than Composite College and demonstrate a very positive attitude toward career programs (4.8). Over 75% of the student body is enrolled in occupational programs with this high percentage reflected in the occupational education audience served by their developmental efforts. The programmatic design employed is a center approach with courses usually offered in reading, study skills, and writing on an individual or non-credit basis; in conjunction with other supportive services such as counseling and tutoring. Community needs (4.6) are viewed as an important consideration.

Economic Opportunity Centers. The staff at EOC's possess positive attitudes and understandings (4.0) toward non-traditional students and programs which are above the Composite College mean as ultimately all serve as developmental faculty. This fact diminishes problematic areas associated with faculty interactions, administrative support, line/staff and budgeting. The student body represents the lower SES level (1.0) and has an inner-city background (5.0). The minority population



tends to comprise over 50% of the student body. EOC's, by definition, operate to meet student needs (4.3). The major audience served are those students enrolled in certificate programs. The majority of support comes from SUNY funds although there are small grant resources. Programmatic approaches are eclectic in that usually it consists of a center and supporting services in conjunction with courses.

City Community Colleges. The city or urban community college faculties have a greater than the Composite average voice in governance (4.6). Their students tend to be more goal oriented (4.6), and come from a more urban background (4.6) than the Composite College. The programmatic approach is often a center with supporting services and courses offered in reading, writing, English as a second language, speech, study skills and math. In some cases, basic skill courses are integrated with content courses (i.e. psychology, history) or utilize skill materials that may be related to the major program of study (i.e. nursing).

Upstate Community Colleges. The upstate community colleges do not vary significantly, except in scope of program or program design, from the description of Composite College. The greatest difference is the 10% minority population which is one-half that segment in the Composite.

### Commonalities of Programs

The preceding discussion underscores diversity while simultaneously indicating areas of commonalities among programs. These commonalities cut across programmatic approaches and institutional settings, and are illustrated in the following statements:

1. Faculty members at two-year institutions generally value effective teaching and career programs to a great extent.
2. Institutions respond to student and community needs in a moderately active degree.
3. Developmental programs are rated at better than moderately successful although there remains need for a more successful image generally, as evidenced by lower "other" faculty ratings.
4. Students are usually from middle/lower to lower SES levels, and they are seen to exhibit goal orientation of moderate strength.
5. Student academic needs in reading, study, communication and math skills are universal followed closely by non-academic needs such as motivation, career decision-making skills, and knowledge of self.
6. Components of developmental programs reflect student needs utilizing a variety of programmatic designs. Several kinds of supporting services and components address personal non-academic student needs.
7. The clientele of developmental efforts are usually comprised of 50%+ enrolled in occupational programs; and are usually day/full-time degree or certificate programs.

8. A variety of student selection and recruitment procedures are employed. Testing in some form emerges as the most common technique in both selection and recruitment. Students in career programs are enrolled in developmental offerings through a combination of methods such as faculty advisement, admission scheduling and volunteering.
9. The majority of programs are largely supported by institutional funds, however grants are often employed to initiate and/or supplement.
10. In the forthcoming Section IV, recommended materials, strategies or techniques provided by the respondents are delineated. Commonalities within these recommendations are observable in programmatic components relative to: 1) desired student outcomes, 2) standards of program success, and 3) mode of instruction. With less frequency, commonalities are also discernible for: 1) measurement tools utilized, 2) recommended materials, and 3) unique strategies or approaches.

# AM RESOURCES

ised of resources recommended by respondents  
terials are grouped by components that are most  
l programs. These include reading with a total  
cy of 29, writing with a total identification  
skills with a total identification frequency  
al identification frequency of 22, and  
cision-making with a total identification  
each component, recommendations of more than one  
ad in Resource Summary Charts relative to: a)  
is, b) standards of success, c) unique stra-  
measurement tools, e) recommended materials,  
ion. These strategies and materials are linked  
ironmental characteristics in which they are  
student characteristics, basic program design,  
quency of recommendation. It was determined  
racteristics were more discriminating than  
fell mid-range.

ortance of noting the frequency an item had  
erscored by consensus of the workshop parti-  
bove one are given for each item in the  
Those items having been identified by one  
achment A.

Assessment. Resources that received recommendations from respondents teaching program components that were rated "most successful" are so identified in the Summary Charts.

Special Student Characteristics. To aid in the linking of resources to environment, special student groups with which these resources and techniques have been used are identified. When resources received recommendations from institutions with 50%+ minority population, with an inner-city/urban setting, and/or with 75%+ student population enrolled in occupational education programs, it is shown in the Resource Summary Charts. The lack of an "X" indicates that the materials were recommended by respondents in no particular discriminatory pattern or that they were not recommended by programs reflecting the student characteristics.

Basic Program Design. The diversity of developmental programs is evident in the data. As previously noted, responses can be grouped into four categories: 1) block scheduling -- usually four credit courses a semester in length, i.e. reading, writing, math; 2) centers -- a physical area that serves as a learning or skill center and as programmatic focus; 3) designated courses -- one or two credit courses in basic skill areas or in a content area; and 4) integrated teaching -- a conscious effort and policy to integrate developmental instruction with regular course work. Nearly all respondents described their programs as offering supporting services. The variety of these services ranged from peer tutoring to normal access of counseling services or individual faculty assistance as requested.

Therefore, it is assumed that supporting services are present to some degree in each of the four basic program designs. Recommendations from the respective programmatic approaches are indicated in the Resource Summary Charts.

Other areas identified as additional components by one or two respondents are illustrated by areas such as English as a second language, speech, English, science and business. Usually these areas were singularly identified. By way of illustration, selected additional components are summarized in Attachment B.

## READING PROGRAM COMPONENT: RESOURCE SUMMARY #1

| cm   | Frequency of Identification | Block Scheduling | Program Design<br>Centers | Designated Courses | Integrated Teaching | "Most Successful" Assessment Rating |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <u>sired Student Outcomes</u>  |                             |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| increased comprehension  | 26                          | X                | X                         | X                  | X                   | X                                   |
| increased reading level  | 26                          | X                | X                         | X                  | X                   | X                                   |
| increased reading rate   | 26                          | X                | X                         | X                  | X                   | X                                   |
| increased vocabulary   | 6                           | X                | X                         | X                  | -                   | -                                   |
| positive attitude  | 2                           | X                | -                         | -                  | -                   | -                                   |
| increase enjoyment of reading  | 2                           | X                | X                         | -                  | -                   | -                                   |
| <u>Standards of Success</u>  |                             |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| general improvement  | 19                          | X                | X                         | X                  | X                   | X                                   |
| reading at specified grade level-12th grade level  | 10                          | X                | X                         | X                  | -                   | X                                   |
| 10th grade level   |                             |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| score of 50+ on Stanford Task Exam   | 2                           | X                | -                         | -                  | -                   | -                                   |
| double rate of reading--70% comprehension  | 2                           | -                | -                         | X                  | -                   | -                                   |
| <u>Unique Strategies/Approaches</u>  |                             |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| frequent short readings of high interest selections with immediate test, correction and review | 4                           | X                | X                         | X                  | -                   | X                                   |
| consecutive class-lab periods; instruction followed by practice                                | 3                           | X                | X                         | -                  | -                   | -                                   |
| <u>Assessment Tools</u>  |                             |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| Elson Denny  | 8                           | X                | X                         | X                  | X                   | X                                   |
| Stanford Tests   | 5                           | X                | X                         | X                  | -                   | X                                   |
| California Reading Achievement   | 3                           | X                | X                         | -                  | -                   | X                                   |

30





READING PROGRAM COMPONENT: RESOURCE SUMMARY #1, cont.

| Item   | Frequency of Identification | Block Scheduling | Program Design |                    | Integrated Teaching | "Most Successful" Assessment Ratings |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
|  |                             |                  | Centers        | Designated Courses |                     |                                      |
| <u>Recommended Materials</u>                                 |                             |                  |                |                    |                     |                                      |
| Jamestown Publishers   | 5                           | X                | X              | -                  | -                   | X                                    |
| Topics for the Restless                                      | 3                           |                  |                |                    |                     |                                      |
| Selections from the Black                                    | 4                           |                  |                |                    |                     |                                      |
| Voices from the Bottom                                       | 2                           |                  |                |                    |                     |                                      |
| Bantam Series -- High Interest Paperbacks                    | 5                           | -                | X              | X                  | X                   | X                                    |
| SRA Reading for Understanding                                | 4                           | X                | -              | X                  | X                   | -                                    |
| SRA Reading Lab  | 3                           | -                | X              | -                  | -                   | -                                    |
| PROBE: Workbook and Cassettes, C. Merrill Publishing Company | 3                           | -                | X              | X                  | -                   | -                                    |
| EDL Controlled Reader and Skimmer                            | 3                           | X                | -              | -                  | X                   | -                                    |
| Factics II, III  | 3                           | X                | X              | X                  | X                   | -                                    |
| How to Read Factual Literature (W. Pauk)                     | 2                           | -                | X              | -                  | -                   | -                                    |
| Program SRA  | 2                           | -                | X              | -                  | -                   | -                                    |
| Be a Better Reader   | 2                           | -                | -              | X                  | -                   | -                                    |
| Reading Versatility (W. Boyce Adams)                         | 2                           | X                | X              | -                  | -                   | X                                    |
| Six-Way Paragraphs (W. Pauk)                                 | 2                           | X                | X              | -                  | -                   | X                                    |
| McGraw Hill Basic Skills                                     | 2                           | X                | -              | X                  | -                   | -                                    |
| <u>Mode of Instruction</u>                                   |                             |                  |                |                    |                     |                                      |
| learning lab   | 17                          |                  |                |                    |                     |                                      |
| discussion   | 14                          |                  |                |                    |                     |                                      |
| audio/tutorial   | 9                           |                  |                |                    |                     |                                      |
| lecture  | 7                           |                  |                |                    |                     |                                      |
| tutoring   | 4                           |                  |                |                    |                     |                                      |
| seminar  | 4                           |                  |                |                    |                     |                                      |

| Special Student Characteristics |                             |                                   | Diagnostic | Pre-Post |  |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|----------|--|
| r City/Urban                    | 50%+ Minority<br>Population | 75%+ in Occupational<br>Education |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                           | -                                 |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                           | -                                 |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                           | -                                 |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                           | -                                 |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                           | -                                 |            |          |  |
| X                               | X                           | X                                 |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                           | X                                 |            |          |  |
| X                               | X                           | -                                 |            |          |  |
| X                               | X                           | -                                 |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                           | X                                 |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                           | X                                 |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                           | X                                 |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                           | -                                 |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                           | -                                 |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                           | X                                 |            |          |  |
| X                               | X                           | -                                 |            |          |  |

STUDY SKILLS PROGRAM COMPONENT: RESOURCE SUMMARY #2

| Item   | Frequency of Identification | Block Scheduling | Program Design<br>Centers | Designated Courses | Integrated Teaching | "Most Successful" Assessment Rating |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <u>Desired Student Outcomes</u>                  |                             |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| time management skills                           | 21                          | X                | X                         | X                  | X                   | X                                   |
| task organization skills                         | 19                          | X                | X                         | X                  | -                   | -                                   |
| <u>Standards of Success</u>                      |                             |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| general improvement                              | 17                          | X                | X                         | X                  | X                   | X                                   |
| <u>Unique Strategies/Approaches</u>              |                             |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| bi-weekly plan sheet                             | 2                           | X                | X                         | -                  | -                   | X                                   |
| main idea, example clues                         | 2                           | -                | X                         | -                  | -                   | -                                   |
| SQ4R study method                                | 2                           | -                | -                         | -                  | -                   | -                                   |
| <u>Measurement Tools</u>                         |                             |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| Brown Holtzman                                   | 2                           | -                | X                         | X                  | -                   | X                                   |
| <u>Recommended Materials</u>                     |                             |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| How to Study in College<br>(W. Pauk)             | 7                           | X                | X                         | X                  | -                   | X                                   |
| Listen and Read -- EDL Program<br>With Cassettes | 3                           | -                | X                         | -                  | -                   | -                                   |
| How to Survive in College --<br>Cassettes        | 3                           | -                | X                         | X                  | -                   | X                                   |
| Effective Study (Robinson)                       | 2                           | -                | X                         | X                  | -                   | -                                   |
| <u>Mode of Instruction</u>                       |                             |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| lecture  | 13                          |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| discussion                                       | 12                          |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| learning lab                                     | 8                           |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| seminar  | 6                           |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| tutoring   | 5                           |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| audio/tutorial                                   | 2                           |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |

34

| Special Student Characteristics |                          |                                | Diagnostic | Pre-Post |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|----------|
| Inner City/Urban                | 50%+ Minority Population | 75%+ in Occupational Education |            |          |
| X                               | X                        | X                              |            |          |
| X                               | X                        | X                              |            |          |
|                                 |                          |                                |            |          |
| X                               | X                        | X                              |            |          |
|                                 |                          |                                |            |          |
| -                               | -                        | X                              |            |          |
| -                               | -                        | X                              |            |          |
| -                               | -                        | -                              |            |          |
|                                 |                          |                                |            |          |
| -                               | -                        | X                              | X          | -        |
|                                 |                          |                                |            |          |
| -                               | -                        | X                              |            |          |
| -                               | -                        | X                              |            |          |
| -                               | -                        | X                              |            |          |
| -                               | -                        | -                              |            |          |

35

WRITING PROGRAM COMPONENT: RESOURCE SUMMARY #3

| Item   | Frequency of Identification | Block Scheduling | Program Design Centers | Designated Courses | Integrated Teaching | "Most Successful" Assessment Rating |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <u>Desired Student Outcomes</u>  |                             |                  |                        |                    |                     |                                     |
| improved grammar usage   | 23                          | X                | X                      | X                  | X                   | X                                   |
| improved sentence structure  | 23                          | X                | X                      | X                  | X                   | X                                   |
| improved spelling  | 19                          | X                | X                      | X                  | X                   | X                                   |
| improved theme structure   | 19                          | X                | X                      | X                  | X                   | X                                   |
| improved style   | 17                          | X                | X                      | X                  | X                   | X                                   |
| increased confidence   | 3                           | X                | X                      | -                  | X                   | X                                   |
| logic of organization of thought and writing   | 3                           | X                | X                      | X                  | X                   | -                                   |
| structure and development  | 2                           | X                | -                      | X                  | -                   | X                                   |
| improved vocabulary  | 2                           | X                | -                      | X                  | -                   | -                                   |
| <u>Standards of Success</u>  |                             |                  |                        |                    |                     |                                     |
| general improvement  | 18                          | X                | X                      | X                  | X                   | X                                   |
| demonstrate ability to write an acceptable essay   | 16                          | X                | X                      | X                  | X                   | X                                   |
| skills in specific content   | 3                           | X                | -                      | X                  | -                   | X                                   |
| <u>Unique Strategies/Approaches</u>  |                             |                  |                        |                    |                     |                                     |
| small group peer evaluation  | 5                           | X                | X                      | X                  | -                   | -                                   |
| tutor conferences  | 2                           | -                | X                      | X                  | -                   | -                                   |
| pre and post conferences   | 2                           | -                | -                      | -                  | -                   | -                                   |
| <u>Measurement Tools</u>   |                             |                  |                        |                    |                     |                                     |
| essay or writing sample  | 8                           | -                | X                      | X                  | -                   | X                                   |
| <u>Recommended Materials</u>   |                             |                  |                        |                    |                     |                                     |
| Paragraph Practice (Kathleen Sullivan)   | 4                           | -                | X                      | X                  | -                   | X                                   |
| English 3200 and English 2600 (Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich)                                      | 3                           | X                | X                      | X                  | -                   | X                                   |
| Essays, articles, short stories from NY Times, Saturday Review, Atlantic, NY Magazine and others | 2                           | -                | X                      | -                  | -                   | X                                   |
| Steps in Composition (Troyka and Nudelman)   | 2                           | -                | X                      | -                  | -                   | X                                   |
| Sentence Combining (W. Strong; Random House)   | 2                           | -                | -                      | -                  | -                   | -                                   |
| <u>Mode of Instruction</u>   |                             |                  |                        |                    |                     |                                     |
| discussion   | 12                          |                  |                        |                    |                     |                                     |
| skill(s) lab   | 11                          |                  |                        |                    |                     |                                     |
| tutoring   | 11                          |                  |                        |                    |                     |                                     |
| lecture  | 10                          |                  |                        |                    |                     |                                     |
| seminar  | 7                           |                  |                        |                    |                     |                                     |
| individual instruction   | 2                           |                  |                        |                    |                     |                                     |

| Special Student Characteristics |                          |                                | Diagnostic | Pre-Post |  |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|----------|--|
| Inner City/Urban                | 50%+ Minority Population | 75%+ in Occupational Education |            |          |  |
| X                               | X                        | X                              |            |          |  |
| X                               | X                        | X                              |            |          |  |
| X                               | X                        | X                              |            |          |  |
| X                               | X                        | X                              |            |          |  |
| X                               | X                        | X                              |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                        | X                              |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                        | X                              |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                        | X                              |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                        | -                              |            |          |  |
| X                               | X                        | X                              |            |          |  |
| X                               | X                        | X                              |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                        | X                              |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                        | -                              |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                        | -                              |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                        | -                              |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                        | -                              |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                        | -                              | X          | -        |  |
| -                               | -                        | -                              |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                        | X                              |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                        | X                              |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                        | -                              |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                        | X                              |            |          |  |
| -                               | -                        | -                              |            |          |  |
|                                 |                          |                                | 37         |          |  |

MATH PROGRAM COMPONENT: RESOURCE SUMMARY #4

| Item   | Frequency of<br>Identification | Block<br>Scheduling | Program Design |                       | Integrated<br>Teaching | "Most Successful"<br>Assessment Rating |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--|
|  |                                |                     | Centers        | Designated<br>Courses |                        |  |
| <u>Desired Student Outcomes</u>  |                                |                     |                |                       |                        |  |
| improve basic arithmetical<br>computational and<br>reasoning skills        | 16                             | X                   | -              | X                     | X                      | X                                      |
| improve computational and<br>reasoning skills used<br>in Algebra           | 16                             | X                   | X              | X                     | X                      | X                                      |
| <u>Standards of Success</u>  |                                |                     |                |                       |                        |  |
| math through elementary<br>algebra   | 12                             | X                   | -              | X                     | X                      | X                                      |
| general improvement  | 8                              | X                   | -              | X                     | X                      | X                                      |
| <u>Unique Strategies/Approaches</u>  |                                |                     |                |                       |                        |  |
| small group study  | 2                              | -                   | X              | X                     | -                      | -                                      |
| <u>Measurement Tools</u>   |                                |                     |                |                       |                        |  |
| *  |                                |                     |                |                       |                        |  |
| <u>Recommended Materials</u>   |                                |                     |                |                       |                        |  |
| Elementary Algebra<br>(Moon and Davis; C. Merrill<br>Publishing Company)   | 3                              | X                   | -              | X                     | X                      | -                                      |
| Intermediate Algebra<br>(Moon and Davis; C. Merrill<br>Publishing Company) | 2                              | X                   | -              | -                     | -                      | -                                      |
| Mainstream Tapes<br>(C. Merrill Publishing<br>Company)                     | 2                              | -                   | X              | -                     | -                      | -                                      |
| <u>Mode of Instruction</u>   |                                |                     |                |                       |                        |  |
| tutoring   | 7                              |                     |                |                       |                        |  |
| discussion   | 6                              |                     |                |                       |                        |  |
| learning lab   | 6                              |                     |                |                       |                        |  |
| audio/tutorial   | 4                              |                     |                |                       |                        |  |
| lecture  | 2                              |                     |                |                       |                        |  |

\*No measurement tools were identified more than once.

| <i>Special Student Characteristics</i> |                                 |                                       | <i>Diagnostic</i> | <i>Pre-Post</i> |  |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|
| <i>Inner City/Urban</i>                | <i>50%+ Minority Population</i> | <i>75%+ in Occupational Education</i> |                   |                 |  |
| X                                      | X                               | X                                     |                   |                 |  |
| X                                      | X                               | X                                     |                   |                 |  |
| X                                      | X                               | X                                     |                   |                 |  |
| X                                      | X                               | X                                     |                   |                 |  |
| -                                      | -                               | X                                     |                   |                 |  |
| -                                      | -                               | -                                     |                   |                 |  |
| -                                      | -                               | -                                     |                   |                 |  |
| -                                      | -                               | -                                     |                   |                 |  |



VOCATIONAL-PERSONAL DECISION-MAKING PROGRAM COMPONENT: RESOURCE SUMMARY #5

| Item   | Frequency of Identification | Block Scheduling | Program Design<br>Centers | Designated Courses | Integrated Teaching | "Most Successful" Assessment Rating |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <u>Desired Student Outcomes</u>                              |                             |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| improved understanding of personal needs and abilities       | 12                          | X                | X                         | X                  | X                   | X                                   |
| identification of tentative career goals                     | 6                           | X                | X                         | X                  | -                   | -                                   |
| selection of program major                                   | 3                           | -                | X                         | X                  | -                   | -                                   |
| <u>Standards of Success</u>                                  |                             |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| general improvement  | 4                           | X                | X                         | X                  | -                   | -                                   |
| <u>Unique Strategies/Approaches</u>                          |                             |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| Interest Tests: Kuder or GATB                                | 2                           | -                | X                         | X                  | -                   | -                                   |
| <u>Measurement Tools</u>                                     |                             |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory                           | 7                           | X                | X                         | X                  | -                   | -                                   |
| Kuder Preference Inventory                                   | 2                           | -                | X                         | X                  | -                   | -                                   |
| Hall's Occupational Orientation Inventory                    | 2                           | -                | X                         | X                  | -                   | -                                   |
| <u>Recommended Materials</u>                                 |                             |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| CEEB Decision Making Materials (Decision/Outcomes; Deciding) | 4                           | -                | X                         | X                  | -                   | -                                   |
| <u>Mode of Instruction</u>                                   |                             |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| group experiences  | 9                           |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| discussion   | 8                           |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| one-to-one   | 7                           |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| lecture  | 4                           |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| seminar  | 4                           |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |
| audio-tutorial   | 2                           |                  |                           |                    |                     |                                     |

40

| Characteristics<br>by 75%+ in Occupational<br>Education | Diagnostic | Pre-Post |  |
|---|------------|----------|--|
|   |            |          |  |
| x   |            |          |  |
| x   |            |          |  |
| x   |            |          |  |
|   |            |          |  |
| x   |            |          |  |
|   |            |          |  |
| x   |            |          |  |
|   |            |          |  |
| -   | -          | -        |  |
| -   | -          | -        |  |
| -   | -          | -        |  |
|   |            |          |  |
| -   |            |          |  |
|   |            |          |  |
|   |            |          |  |
|   |            |          |  |
|   |            |          |  |
|   |            |          |  |
|   |            |          |  |
|   |            |          |  |
|   | 41         |          |  |

### Recommendations for Programmatic Standards

An intended long-range outcome of the project has been the identification of standards or quality measures for developmental studies programs. The questionnaire data synthesis and the discussions by the workshop participants point to recommendations of what ought to be, rather than validated criterion measures based on what is.

Many but not all staff members, for example, feel that an eleventh grade reading level should be a program exit criterion. Some staff members feel that a well-written essay is an appropriate indicator while others look to discrete writing skills as evidence. Several programs use an interdepartmental mathematics examination as a proficiency measure, but the proficiency level required for engineering technology differs from that necessary for many human service programs. An improved self-concept and increased skill in decision-making were listed as goals of many developmental programs but few require that a firm career goal be set as an exit criterion.

Because of this diversity consensus from data was reached on only one rather comprehensive exit standard, general improvement. This criterion is defined as the instructor's judgment that improvement in skills and attitudes has taken place to the extent that the student now has a reasonable chance to succeed in his or her chosen course of study. Instructor judgment is arrived at through a variety of assessment techniques ranging from standardized test measures to observation of behaviors that reflect attitude changes.

The data resulted in several commonalities among programs as identified in the preceding Resource Summary Charts. These commonalities provide recommendations in the form of state-of-the-art standards. However, the data available at this time does not provide sufficient evidence to support recommendations in the form of quantified quality measures to which all programs should subscribe.

The following consensus recommendations supplement the data-based commonalities and provide direction from which institutions can establish their local performance standards given student needs, institutional characteristics, and available resources.

1. Instructors for developmental programs should hold faculty rank and be recruited as specialists in developmental education.
2. The remedial or learning skills center should be organized and staffed by professionals trained and experienced in developmental education.
3. Communication and interaction among faculty and staff should be operational to not only encourage positive attitudes but to provide for professional growth.
4. The teaching assignment of developmental instructors should include time allocation for joint planning and follow-up activities.
5. A realistic range of entrance and exit measures should be established in accordance with institutional policy.
6. A diagnostic testing program should be used as the basis for assessing student progress through performance objectives or competencies identified for all components of developmental programs.
7. To the extent possible, subject matter used in developmental courses should be drawn from regular college courses and the skills taught should be those needed by students in their occupational program areas.

8. Courses should be credit-bearing, and class size should enhance the use of individualized instruction techniques.
9. Institutional course scheduling should be sufficiently flexible to allow students to take advantage of segments of developmental programs as needed.
10. Labs and classroom facilities used in developmental programs should not be physically isolated from other institutional services and courses.
11. Existing counseling services, if not an organized program component, should be closely integrated with the developmental studies program.
12. A peer tutoring or tutoring program should be professionally organized and managed as part of the developmental effort.
13. The faculty and administration should examine the question of institutional versus student accommodation; the extent to which the institution can change techniques, textbooks and schedules or must the student always change to meet existing standards.

# HUMAN RESOURCES

Staff members who completed one or more of the survey forms were asked to indicate whether or not they would be willing to be identified as a contact person for developmental programs. Eighty-seven staff members agreed to be so identified. Names, institutional addresses, title and appropriate program component are listed to facilitate direct contact by colleagues who are interested in sharing or inquiring about aspects or items relative to developmental studies programs.

## Private Colleges

|                                    |                             |                    |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Jr. College of Albany -----</b> | <b>Russell E. Wise, Jr.</b> | <b>COORDINATOR</b> |
| <b>Albany, New York 12208</b>      | <b>Director, HEOP</b>       |                    |

|                                    |                |
|------------------------------------|----------------|
| <b>Carol Benjamin</b>              | <b>READING</b> |
| <b>Learning Center Coordinator</b> |                |

|                            |             |
|----------------------------|-------------|
| <b>William M. Cummings</b> | <b>MATH</b> |
| <b>Instructor</b>          |             |

|                                   |                        |             |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|
| <b>Mater Dei College -----</b>    | <b>Sylvia Connolly</b> | <b>MATH</b> |
| <b>Ogdensburg, New York 13669</b> | <b>Instructor</b>      |             |

|                               |                |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| <b>Linda Swanson</b>          | <b>READING</b> |
| <b>Coordinator</b>            |                |
| <b>Learning Skills Center</b> |                |

|                                  |                              |                          |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Villa Maria College -----</b> | <b>Jerome Neuner</b>         | <b>COORDINATOR,</b>      |
| <b>of Buffalo</b>                | <b>Instructor</b>            | <b>READING, WRITING,</b> |
| <b>240 Pine Ridge Road</b>       | <b>Developmental Studies</b> | <b>STUDY SKILLS</b>      |
| <b>Buffalo, New York 14225</b>   |                              |                          |

Agricultural and Technical Colleges

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Alfred Agricultural and<br/>Technical College</b><br><b>Alfred, New York 14802</b>         | <b>Rosemary Lanshe, Director</b><br><b>Reading and Study Skills</b> | <b>READING and STUDY SK</b>                       |
|   | <b>Dr. L. Constantine</b>   | <b>WRITING</b>                                    |
|   | <b>Dennis T. Johnson</b>  | <b>MATH</b>                                       |
| <b>Canton Agricultural and<br/>Technical College</b><br><b>Canton, New York 13617</b>         | <b>Dr. John D. Ryan, Dean</b><br><b>Arts and Sciences</b>           | <b>COORDINATOR</b>                                |
|   | <b>Frederick C. Monaco</b><br><b>Assistant Professor</b>            | <b>MATH</b>                                       |
|   | <b>H. J. Stephens</b><br><b>Associate Professor</b>                 | <b>STUDY SKILLS</b>                               |
|   | <b>John G. A. O'Neil</b><br><b>Associate Professor</b>              | <b>WRITING</b>                                    |
|   | <b>Joseph Lamendola</b><br><b>Associate Professor</b>               | <b>READING</b>                                    |
| <b>Cobleskill Agricultural<br/>and Technical College</b><br><b>Cobleskill, New York 12043</b> | <b>Leo A. Bryant</b><br><b>Director, EOP</b>                        | <b>COORDINATOR</b>                                |
|   | <b>Donald Cohen</b><br><b>Professor</b>                             | <b>MATH</b>                                       |
|   | <b>James Nuhlicek</b><br><b>Assistant Professor</b>                 | <b>WRITING</b>                                    |
|   | <b>Veronica Morano Smith</b><br><b>Assistant Professor</b>          | <b>STUDY SKILLS,<br/>READING</b>                  |
|   | <b>Charles W. Merrill</b><br><b>Professor</b>                       | <b>ADDITIONAL COMPONENT--<br/>GENERAL BIOLOGY</b> |

Delhi Agricultural -----  
and Technical College  
Delhi, New York 13753

Virginia Abrahamsen  
Professor

COORDINATOR,  
READING, WRITING, MATH,  
STUDY SKILLS, DECISION-  
MAKING

ADDITIONAL COMPONENTS--  
PEER TUTORING, FACULTY  
REFERRAL OF STUDENTS NEEDING  
ASSISTANCE, FACULTY WORK-  
SHOPS, COLLEGE SKILLS FOR  
NON-TRADITIONAL STUDENTS

Morrisville Agricultural -----  
and Technical College  
Morrisville, New York 13408

Fred Hildebrand  
Instructor

COORDINATOR,  
STUDY SKILLS, READING,  
WRITING



Community Colleges

Borough of Manhattan  
Community College  
135 West 70th Street  
New York, New York 10027

Dr. Henry Pruitt  
Assistant Professor/  
Department Chairman

COORDINATOR,  
READING

Charlotte G. McIver

ADDITIONAL COMPONENT--  
ENGLISH AS A SECOND  
LANGUAGE

Broome Community College  
Front Street  
Binghamton, New York 13902

Sharon K. View  
Counselor

DECISION-MAKING

Columbia-Greene Community College  
Box 1000  
Hudson, New York 12534

Mary D. Hoddick  
Director

COORDINATOR

Corning Community College  
Corning, New York 14830

Anne Cohn  
Director, Special Programs

COORDINATOR,  
READING

Penelope Smith  
Instructional Assistant  
Math Lab

MATH

Kenneth A. Miller  
Professor

WRITING

Clark Maloney  
Dean of Students

DECISION-MAKING

Dutchess Community College  
Poughkeepsie, New York 12601

Deborah Weibman  
Coordinator, Study Skills

COORDINATOR,  
STUDY SKILLS

|  |   |                                   |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| Fulton-Montgomery Community College -----<br>Johnstown, New York 12095 | Harold R. Morrell<br>Reading and Study Skills | COORDINATOR,<br>READING           |
|  | George Pilkey<br>Director of Counseling       | DECISION-MAKING                   |
|  | Arlene C. Rambush<br>Associate Professor      | WRITING                           |
| Hudson Valley Community College -----<br>Troy, New York 12180          | Edward F. Wightman<br>Developmental Program   | COORDINATOR                       |
|  | Dana L. Johnson<br>Assistant Professor        | STUDY SKILLS                      |
|  | William G. Muller<br>Assistant Professor      | WRITING                           |
|  | Ruby Painton<br>Assistant Professor           | MATH                              |
|  | Ruth Getbehead<br>Instructor                  | READING                           |
|  | Stephen Hyatt<br>Instructor                   | ADDITIONAL COMPONENT--<br>BIOLOGY |
| Jamestown Community College -----<br>Jamestown, New York 14701         | Elaine S. Johnson<br>Developmental Studies    | COORDINATOR,<br>MATH              |
|  | Doug Skuggen                                  | READING, WRITING                  |
|  | Wyman Ansley<br>Counselor                     | STUDY SKILLS,<br>DECISION-MAKING  |
| Jefferson Community College -----<br>Watertown, New York 13601         | James T. Hogancamp<br>Assistant Professor     | READING,<br>STUDY SKILLS          |
|  | David R. Moore<br>Assistant Professor         | DECISION-MAKING                   |
|  | Carol Y. Scanlon<br>Associate Professor       | WRITING                           |

Mohawk Valley Community College -----  
1101 Sherman Drive  
Utica, New York 13501

Paul M. Guerra  
Director, Learning Center

COORDINATOR,  
DECISION-MAKING

Monroe Community College -----  
Rochester, New York 14623

Anthony D. Rosica  
Acting Director  
Developmental Studies

COORDINATOR,  
MATH, WRITING, READING,  
STUDY SKILLS

Nassau County Community College -----  
Stewart Avenue  
Garden City, New York 11530

James J. Richards  
Chairperson  
Student Personnel Services

DECISION-MAKING

Thomas E. Nealon  
Chairman, Department of  
Reading Services

COORDINATOR,  
READING, STUDY SKILLS

Hedda Marcus  
Instructor

WRITING

Niagara County Community College -----  
Saunders Settlement Road  
Sanborn, New York 14132

Dr. Kathleen McWhorter  
Director, Learning Skills Center

COORDINATOR,  
READING

Dr. Gary Livent  
Director, Counseling

DECISION-MAKING

Kenneth Raymond  
Professor

MATH

North Country Community College -----  
Saranac Lake, New York 12983

Edward Stodola  
Director of Counseling

COORDINATOR

Patricia Wiley  
Assistant Professor

READING

Ken Youngblood  
Assistant Professor

WRITING

Robert Abdo  
Assistant Professor

STUDY SKILLS

Orange County Community College -----  
South Street  
Middletown, New York 10940

D. Linda Girardin  
Prep and EOP

COORDINATOR

Norma Eill  
Associate Professor

READING, STUDY SKILLS

Derek Bloomfield  
Assistant Professor

MATH

Robert Greenman  
Professor

OTHER COMPONENT--  
SOCIAL SCIENCE SKILLS

Queensborough Community College -----  
56th Avenue and Springfield  
Bayside, New York 11364

Judith Barbanel  
Principal Investigator

COORDINATOR,  
WRITING

Sandra Seltzer  
Principal Investigator

WRITING

Arnold Steiner  
Project Director

WRITING

Rockland Community College -----  
145 College Road  
Suffern, New York 10901

Dr. Margaret Martin  
College Skills Program

COORDINATOR

Ellen Klohmann  
Instructor

READING, WRITING,  
STUDY SKILLS

Marie Caruso  
Counselor

DECISION-MAKING

Schenectady County Community College -----  
Washington Avenue  
Schenectady, New York 12305

Marilyn M. Starer  
Instructor

WRITING

Jessie Malheiros  
Assistant Professor

READING,  
STUDY SKILLS

Tompkins-Cortland Community College -----  
Dryden, New York 13053

Nancy Lieberman  
Developmental Studies Program

COORDINATOR,  
MATH, DECISION-MAKING

Pat Bonney  
Director, Writing Lab

WRITING

Ulster County Community College -----  
Stone Ridge, New York 12484

Lawrence P. Borzumato  
Director, College Skills Center

COORDINATOR,  
READING

J. F. Quirk  
Counselor

DECISION-MAKING

L. James Hess  
Chairman, English Department

WRITING

Rhoda R. Mones  
Professor

ADDITIONAL COMPONENT--  
SPEECH/THEATRE

Edward Peifer  
Assistant Professor

MATH

Joyce Blake  
Instructor

STUDY SKILLS

EOC Centers

Brooklyn EOC -----  
470 Vanderbilt Avenue  
Brooklyn, New York

Joyce A. McCoy

READING

Aliyah Abdol Karim

STUDY SKILLS

Buffalo EOC -----  
Room 403  
465 Washington Street  
Buffalo, New York 14203

Claudia E. Chiesi  
Program Development  
and Research

COORDINATOR

Earle M. Lacey  
Associate Director  
Program Development  
and Research

MATH, WRITING,  
READING

Schenectady EOC -----  
240 Broadway  
Schenectady, New York 12305

Edith N. Jones  
Assistant to the Director

COORDINATOR

Lorraine Boaz  
Instructor

ADDITIONAL COMPONENT--  
SECRETARIAL SCIENCE

Allen Brown  
Instructor

DECISION-MAKING

Syracuse EOC -----  
155 Gifford Street  
Syracuse, New York 13215

Nancy Brisson  
Head of Reading Department

READING

Edith V. Robinson, Head  
Department of English

WRITING

Michael O. Sedore  
Assistant Professor

MATH



## ATTACHMENT A

Attachment A presents resources that were recommended by one respondent. These are included so that they may be used as a reference as appropriate.

### Reading Program Component

#### Desired Student Outcomes

better understanding  
skimming and scanning techniques  
development of flexible reading skills  
growth of grade level  
adjust reading rate  
high school equivalency

#### Standards of Success

Davis Reading Test  
Nelson-Denny pre-post testing  
student judgment on improvement

#### Unique Strategies/Approaches

required minimum of reading  
quarter system, requiring several modules  
lab work, completed at 80% or better  
competency based learning  
working on a one-to-one basis  
short readings with written oral testing  
personal journal in which students identify  
reading strengths/weaknesses; in-  
struction directed toward their  
identified needs  
dual testing-teacher and student read the  
same selection, take tests individually,  
then discuss answers  
using student assistants who have already been  
through the program  
limit the class size to five  
student corrects own work for immediate feed-  
back  
comfortable, attractive room for sustained  
silent reading and textbook study  
comprehension and factual questions  
popular paperbacks divided into chapters-  
class members read and report  
Jamestown Timed Reading Exercises  
cognitive style mapping  
reading eye camera  
individual tutorial with tests and with in-  
dividual speed machines  
individual reading-student chooses material;  
teacher and student discuss  
audio-visual aids with instant self-testing  
class periods with immediate testing  
vocabulary worksheets  
present vocabulary before reading selections  
written sums of paperbacks or magazine  
articles  
short time segments dealing with definite  
areas of reading  
fiction and essays with discussions on literal,  
critical and affective comprehension  
core course using interpersonal relationships as  
vehicle for skills work  
use articles and file after readability indexed

#### Measurement Tools

Diagnosis-----English Cooperative Reading Test  
Gates MacGinitie Reading Test  
Tactics II  
RFU Placement Test  
EDL Eye Camera Test  
Iowa Silent Reading  
read aloud ungraded material  
Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales  
Xerox Listening Test  
high school reading records  
REAL  
SRA Every Day Adult  
Reading Efficiency Test

#### Pre-Post

Gain Scores---English Cooperative Reading Test  
Gates MacGinitie Reading Test  
RFU Placement Test  
Stanford Tasks  
tests of comprehension and rate related  
to texts  
Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales  
Cornell Study Skills Inventory  
cooperative reading  
comprehension test  
Davis Reading Test  
Reading Research Center-University  
of Wyoming  
Gates MacGinitie  
Iowa Silent Reading Test-Level II  
Diagnostic Reading Survey-Triggs

#### Recommended Materials

Increased Reading Efficiency and Maintaining  
Reading Efficiency (Miller)  
Efficient Reading (J. Brown; Houghton-Mifflin Company)  
Toward Reading Comprehension, Book 2  
(J. F. Sherburne; D. C. Heath Company)  
How to Survive in College  
Instructional/Communications Technology  
Readings for Understanding (Thelma Gwinn Thurston)  
Wordcraft 3-Communicad  
PAR  
Vocabulary for College Students  
Structural Approach to Reading Improvement  
Vocabulary: English Vocabulary Cards

#### Mode of Instruction

timed readings  
reading and answering questions  
structured classroom  
daily practice  
two levels of programs-class and lab

ent

# Measurement Tools

study  
notes

Diagnosis-----McGraw Hill CTB  
Wrenn's Checklist  
SSHA  
class discussion  
library constructed test  
informal  
use own diagnostic instrument

areas  
Science course

Pre-Post  
Gain Scores---McGraw Hill Basic Skills  
Nelson Denny  
Purdue High School English Test  
Madden Peak Computational  
Self-Evaluation

ing

and note taking

# Recommended Materials

atives-80% achievement  
nce objectives

Academic Skills Program (Quest, Cohen, King, et.al.)  
Variety of texts and self development exercises  
Studying Effectively (Gilbert, Wrenn)  
Joffe materials (Wadsworth Publications)  
College Skills Program (Sack, Yourman-Reading and  
Social Studies series combined with an approach  
that allows students to discover own needs)  
Basic Skill Program (McGraw Hill)  
Systems for Study (McGraw Hill)  
How to Read and Study for Success in College  
(Holt, Rinehart)  
Innovation Learning Strategies, 1975-SRA, Special  
Groups (edited by Stan Klosek, Ayahoga College)  
How to Take Tests (J. Millman and W. Pauk)  
How to Write Themes and Term Papers (B. Ellis)  
Developing Reading Efficiency (Hess)  
Writing the Research Term Paper (Houser and Gray)  
The Reading Line-Social Studies (Irene Reiter)  
Student's Guide to Effective Study (Brown)  
How to Study (Morgan and Reese)  
Best Methods of Study (Smith)  
Learning to Learn (Smith, et.al.)  
Study Skills Cassettes and Filmstrips (New York Times)  
Singer-Graflex Audio Study Materials

anxiety  
nce

es

ly or weekly planning

ose specific  
to improve

# Mode of Instruction

: logs work, play  
own strengths and

assessment  
study guides

, students direct

oss over of skills  
other

ills and overcoming

accomplishment of  
lay  
ntal set for studying

cise

es-3-5 students in groups  
plan and study jointly  
velopment of concepts

discussion and

of study problems



## Writing Program Component

### Desired Student Outcomes

logic, critical reading  
emphasis on adequate writing  
library resource  
improve reading and listening skills

### Standards of Success

peer judgment  
acceptable paragraph essay  
achieve success in job/school  
competent for "C" in composition  
grammar/mechanics test  
basic research project measurably improved  
student judgment

### Unique Strategies/Approaches

diagnostic essay  
taxonomy of writing difficulties  
mastery quizzes  
small group instruction; instant evaluation  
and feedback  
in-class writing from models  
difficulty of conveying one's Gestalt to  
another  
small group of students do rewrites of other  
papers  
discover what is involved in reading and  
listening then write for the benefit of  
listener or reader from that point of view  
writer takes point of view of someone else  
manageable groups-20 or less  
mastery learning techniques with each  
written assignment  
students begin writing about their interest  
areas  
individual or small group instruction  
student/instructor conferences  
heuristics (several systems) journal,  
sentence, etc.  
class exchange  
actively engaged in writing experience at  
each session  
daily journal writing  
individual chapters-orally shared; base  
listening and writing or reading  
experiential writing  
diagnosis of specific problem areas to en-  
courage prompt improvement  
outline of topics as group  
workshop approach  
use accessible models from students

### Measurement Tools

Diagnosis-----personal diagnostic sheets  
SAT-ACT  
Harbrace Diagnostic Tests  
tests for business english essentials  
Educational Skills Test

### Pre-Post

Gain Scores---English 3200 tests  
English 2600 tests  
modified Holistic Scale  
locally developed instrument: Seltzer/  
Steiner/Kogen Taxonomy  
CEEB Advanced Placement Test  
writing samples

### Recommended Materials

Gestalt Materials  
Eschler on Perspective  
Thesaurus  
English Review Manual  
Harbrace College Workbook  
Correct Writing (Rutler)  
The Practical Stylist (Sheldon Baker)  
You Can Write (Grasso and Maney)  
Grassroots (Writer's Handbook-Fawcett and Sandberg)  
How to Read and Write in College (Dodge)  
Students Guide for Writing Papers (University  
of Chicago Press)  
Write On! (Slack and Cottrell)

### Mode of Instruction

discussion  
demonstrate and edit  
conference and classroom practice  
writing practice  
program workbooks

## Math Component

### Desired Student Outcomes

relieve anxiety over math  
prepare for next course  
attitudes and awareness

### Standards of Success

math through intermediate algebra  
pass non-credit course  
ability to pass math course required  
by department  
80% accuracy of percentage of problems  
math skills grades on modules tests

### Unique Strategies/Approaches

group tests  
sit in on chemistry, physics and general  
science course and correlate these to  
math  
marathon sessions to do remediation  
faculty recommendations, worksheets  
application of math to interdisciplinary  
curricula  
self-paced instruction unit tests  
tutoring  
two teachers available between classes-  
student needs  
topics intersected with English curricula  
experiential activities in graphing, algebra,  
arithmetic and theory  
peer tutoring; self-testing  
Math Learning Lab

### Measurement Tools

Diagnosis-----NYS Minimum Competency Test  
California Achievement Test  
Comparative Guidance and Placement  
Programs of the College Entrance  
Exam Board  
Form A and B of Diagnostic Test in  
front of text  
high school grades  
standard test scores  
personal interview  
department competency test  
local diagnostic test  
short locators and check-up tests  
interviews  
informal  
advising session  
in-house math test

### Pre-Post

Gain Scores---department competency test  
Form A and B of Diagnostic Test in  
front of text  
content test  
series in math modules

### Recommended Materials

Elementary Algebra (Cohen and Cameron; Cummings  
Publications)  
Arithmetic Module (Washington; Cummings Publication  
Essential Arithmetic (Johnson and Willis; Wadsworth  
Publishing Company)  
Essential Algebra (Johnson and Willis; Wadsworth  
Publishing Company)  
any low-level elementary algebra test  
After Math (Creative Publications)  
Video Tapes (Cambridge Book Company)  
Preliminary Math (Amsco School Publishers)  
Series in Math Modules (Ablon et.al.; Cummings  
Publications)  
SRA Basic Computation Skills-Algebra Skills Kit  
Basic Math Forms; Arithmetic-Algebra-Trigonometry  
and the Slide Rule (Keller and Zant; Houghton  
Mifflin Company)  
From Arithmetic to Algebra (Bloomfield Reston  
Division of Prentice Hall)

### Mode of Instruction

seminar  
individual instruction (tutoring)  
program tests  
receive help as needed  
small group study  
self-paced  
problem-solving

### Vocational-Personal Decision-Making Program Component

#### Desired Student Outcomes

\*

#### Standards of Success

better awareness of self  
student judgment outcomes  
self-understanding and relate to career  
clearer identification of career choice  
attendance  
ability to follow verbal/written  
directions  
upgrade employment  
job placement  
idea of goals and design strategy  
personal sense for effectiveness  
interest-involvement

#### Unique Strategies/Approaches

interaction in counseling--in-depth counseling  
peer counseling  
freedom of discussion but opinions must  
be substantiated  
reality-testing, on-site visits by students  
in area of interests  
require individual sessions  
emphasis of cognitive and affective; also  
theory in a credit course

#### Measurement Tools

General Aptitude Test Battery  
Minnesota Vocational Inventory  
Edwards Personal Preference Survey  
Flanagan Aptitude  
Personal Orientation Inventory  
EEPI  
Strong Vocational Interest Battery

#### Recommended Materials

Simon, Monatakes, Rogers, Maslow  
How To Decide: A Guide for Women. If You Don't  
Know Where You're Going, You'll Probably End  
Up Somewhere Else

Occupational Outlook Handbook  
Directory of Occupational Titles - Volume I and  
Volume II  
Career Exploration Kit-SRA  
What Color Is Your Parachute (Balles)  
Achievement Motivation, Goal Setting, Self-Analysis,  
Environmental Search materials  
You Pack Your Own Chute-Film  
Values Clarification, Success Analysis  
Hard Choices: Strategies for Decision-Making  
Center for Humanities-Slide, cassette  
Values Auction

#### Mode of Instruction

learning lab  
tutoring

\*No desired student outcomes with a frequency of less than three were identified.

**ATTACHMENT B**  
**ADDITIONAL COMPONENTS: RESOURCE SUMMARY**

| Item  | Frequency of Identification | Block Scheduling | Program Design Centers Designated Courses | Integrated Teaching | "Most Successful" Assessment Rating | Inner City/ Urban<br>Special Student Characteristics<br>50%+ Minority Population<br>75%+ in Occupational Education |
|---|-----------------------------|------------------|---|---------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <p><u>ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE</u></p> <p><u>Desired Student Outcomes</u></p> <p>essay to meet requirements for Comp. 100</p> <p>prepare students to write English on college level</p> <p>speaking, read, write English</p> <p><u>Standards of Success</u></p> <p>content organized</p> <p>correct sentence structure</p> <p>correct usage of language</p> <p>show measurable improvement</p> <p>communicate in English to enter skills course</p> <p align="center">2</p> <p><u>Unique Strategies/Approaches</u></p> <p>counseling-learning should be investigated</p> <p>model paragraphs-reinforce and stimulation</p> <p>tape recorder for pronunciation</p> <p><u>Measurement Tools</u></p> <p>written/oral tests</p> <p>interview</p> <p>essay</p> <p>Objective Grammar Test</p> <p>Grammar-diction cloze tests</p> <p><u>Recommended Materials</u></p> <p>All "Silent Way" materials</p> <p>Reading Skills Development</p> <p>Writing English As a Second Language</p> <p>Twenty-Six Steps (L. Kunz)</p> <p>Controlled Composition (L. Kunz)</p> <p>teacher-made materials, reproduced materials, tape and video</p> <p><u>Mode of Instruction</u></p> <p>discussion</p> <p>lect.</p> <p>audio/visual</p> <p>student participation as instructional mode</p> <p>practic</p> <p align="center">2</p> | -                           | X                | X   | -                   | -                                   | X  |

| Item  | Frequency of Identification | Block Scheduling | Program Design Centers Designated Courses | Integrated Teaching | "Most Successful" Assessment Rating | Special Student Characteristics<br>Inner City/ 50%+ Minority<br>Urban Population Education |
|---|-----------------------------|------------------|---|---------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <p><u>SCIENCES</u></p> <p><u>Desired Student Outcomes</u></p> <p>improved laboratory skills<br/>ability to write reports clearly</p> <p><u>Standards of Success</u></p> <p>80% or higher on written quizzes<br/>competency in basic lab skills<br/>positive self-evaluation<br/>good notes, test guides<br/>active role in set-up and use of equipment</p> <p><u>Unique Strategies/Approaches</u></p> <p>low-keyed attitude</p> <p><u>Measurement Tools</u></p> <p><u>Recommended Materials</u></p> <p>multi-media learning materials<br/>peer-group tutors</p> <p><u>Mode of Instruction</u></p> <p>lecture<br/>discussion<br/>audio/tutorial<br/>each student has the option of contracting or accepting an individualized time-mode prescription</p> | -                           | X                | -   | -                   | -                                   | X  |

\*No Measurement Tools identified.

| Item   | Frequency of Identification | Block Scheduling | Program Design<br>Centers<br>Designated<br>Courses | Integrated Teaching | "Most Successful" Assessment Rating | Inner City/ Urban | Special Student Characteristics<br>50%+ Minority Population | 75%+ in Occupational Education |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------|--|---------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| <u>BUSINESS AREA</u><br><u>Desired Student Outcomes</u><br>80% wpm dictation<br>45 wpm typing (course goal)<br>alphabetical correspondence<br><u>Standards of Success</u><br>completion of required projects<br>70% minimum grade on final test<br>accurately transcribe material<br>completion of required projects<br><u>Unique Strategies/Approaches</u><br>individual instruction<br><u>Measurement Tools</u><br>Adult Basic Learning Exam<br>timed writings<br>dictation test<br><u>Recommended Materials</u><br>Gregg Typing 300<br>Gregg Shorthand tape<br>timed writings<br><u>Mode of Instruction</u><br>discussion<br>tutoring | -                           | -                | -  | -                   | -                                   | X                 | -   | X                              |



| Item   | Frequency of Identification | Block Scheduling | Program Design Centers Designated Courses | Integrated Teaching | "Most Successful" Assessment Rating | Inner City/ Urban | Special Student Characteristics 50%+ Minority Population 75%+ in Occupational Education |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------|---|---------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| <p><u>SPEECH COMPONENT</u></p> <p><u>Desired Student Outcomes:</u></p> <p>raise diction level</p> <p>increase use of flexibility</p> <p><u>Standards of Success</u></p> <p>improvement in general fluency in speaking</p> <p>ability to hear nuances</p> <p>acquisition of vocabulary</p> <p><u>Unique Strategies/Approaches</u></p> <p>tapes of student voices</p> <p>speech exercises</p> <p>vocabulary lists developed by College Skills Center; used jointly</p> <p><u>Measurement Tools</u></p> <p>tape using basic sounds</p> <p><u>Recommended Materials</u></p> <p>Speak Well-record and booklet</p> <p><u>Mode of Instruction</u></p> <p>discussion</p> <p>audio/tutorial</p> <p>learning lab</p> <p>tutoring</p> | -                           | -                | x   | -                   | -                                   | -                 | -   |

| Item  | Frequency of Identification | Block Scheduling | Program Design<br>Centers<br>Designated<br>Courses | Integrated Teaching | "Most Successful" Assessment Rating | Inner City/<br>Urban<br>Population<br>Special Student Characteristics<br>50%+ Minority<br>75%+ in Occupational Education |
|---|-----------------------------|------------------|--|---------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <p><u>POLITICAL SCIENCE, POLL TAKING AND QUESTIONNAIRES</u></p> <p><u>Desired Student Outcomes</u></p> <p><u>Standards of Success</u></p> <p>demonstrated ability to plan, execute and interpret a questionnaire</p> <p><u>Unique Strategies/Approaches</u></p> <p>students must be presented with real need to do questionnaire</p> <p>examples of poor questionnaire shown to demonstrate problems</p> <p><u>Measurement Tools</u></p> <p><u>Recommended Materials</u></p> <p>AV-"How To" programs</p> <p><u>Mode of Instruction</u></p> <p>audio/tutorial</p> <p>*No Desired Student Outcomes or Measurement Tools identified.</p> |                             |                  |  |                     |                                     |  |

UNIVERSITY OF CAL  
LOS ANGELES

OCT 1 1976

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR  
JUNIOR COLLEGES